

REMARKS

Office action summary

Claims 1, 3-6, 8-16, 18-23, and 25-29 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 9-16, 18-23, and 25-29 are presently amended. The following rejections were made in the office action of September 1, 2009 (“Office Action”):

- Claims 1, 11, and 12 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liang et al, US Patent 7,299,216 (“Liang”), in view of Ardoin et al, US Patent 6,292,804 (“Ardoin”), and further in view of Yokoyama, US Patent Application Publication 2003/0103073 (“Yokoyama”).
- Claims 13 and 14 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liang, in view of Ardoin and Yokoyama, and further in view of Arnold, US Patent 5,535,378 (“Arnold”).
- Claim 15 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liang, in view of Ardoin, Yokoyama, and Arnold, and further in view of Furusho, WO 01/38967 (“Furusho”).
- Claims 3 and 4 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liang, in view of Ardoin and Yokoyama, and further in view of Desai, US Patent 6,567,816 (“Desai”).
- Claims 5, 8, and 9 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liang, in view of Ardoin and Yokoyama, and further in view of MacInnis et al, US Patent Application Publication 2003/0219072 (“MacInnis”).
- Claim 6 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liang, in view of Ardoin, Yokoyama, and Arnold, and further in view of MacInnis.
- Claim 10 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liang, in view of Ardoin, Yokoyama, and further in view of Furusho.
- Claims 16, 18/23, and 25-29 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) for substantially the same reasons as the rejections of claims 1, 3-6, and 8-10.

The present amendments are filed together with a request for continued examination. The amendments and rejections are discussed below. The examiner is respectfully urged to

reconsider the application and withdraw the rejections. Should the examiner have any questions or concerns that might be efficiently resolved by way of a telephonic interview, the examiner is invited to call applicants' undersigned attorney, Jon M. Isaacson, at 206-332-1102.

Rejections under 35 USC § 103(a)

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liang, in view of Ardoin, and further in view of Yokoyama. Without conceding the propriety of the rejection of claim 1, in an effort to advance prosecution of the present application, applicants presently amend claim 1 to clarify the subject matter recited therein. As presently amended, claim 1 recites, "extracting data comprising a plurality of rows...from at least one external data source." Claim 1 also recites "establishing a first set of pointers to the data, the first set of pointers representative of a first transform to the at least one column in the plurality of rows." Further claim 1 recites "establishing a second set of pointers to the data, the second set of pointers representative of a second transform to the at least one column in the plurality of rows, *wherein the second transform is based on the first transform.*" (Emphasis added.) Thus, claim 1 recites two transforms of the data, the first and second transforms, where the second transform is based on the first transform.

Applicants specification provides a non-limiting example of a first transform and a second transform where the second transform is based on the first transform. In Figure 7C, data is depicted in table 440 with rows 442 and columns 420. Figure 7D depicts a first set of pointers 446 to rows 442. In this example, the first transform represented by the first set of pointers would place the rows 442 in ascending order of the employees' last names. Figure 7E depicts a second set of pointers 448 and 450. The second transform represented by the second set of pointers would separate the rows indicating male employees from the rows indicating female employees. In addition, the second transform represented by the second set of pointers would order the separated rows in ascending order of the employees' last names. Thus, in this non-limiting example, the second transform is based on the first transform of ordering the rows in ascending order of the employees' last names.

The Office Action cites to Liang, col. 1 lines 31-34 as teaching both applying a first transform and applying a second transform. The portion of Liang cited to in the Office

Action states, in whole: “Next, the transform function works with the acquired data—using rules or lookup tables, or creating combinations with other data—to convert it to the desired state.” (Liang, col. 1 lines 31-34.) Applicants note first that this portion of Liang fails to teach or suggest two transform functions. The Office Action tries to overcome this deficiency by stating “transforming data is well-known in the art.” (Office Action, pages 2-3.) Applicants respectfully disagree with the Office Action’s assertion that it is obvious to apply two data transforms from the teachings of Liang. However, in an effort to advance prosecution, applicants presently amend claim 1 to recites that “the second transform is based on the first transform.” Applicants respectfully submit that, even assuming that Liang teaches two data transforms, Liang fails to teach or suggest a second data transform based on a first data transform.

In addition to Liang’s failure to teach or suggest a second data transform based on a first data transform, applicants can discern no teaching or suggestion in the cited portions of Liang, Ardoin or Yokoyama which teach or suggest a second data transform based on a first data transform. Therefore, applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentably defined over the cited art. Accordingly, applicants request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC § 103(a).

Independent **claims 11, 16, 23, and 29** stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liang, in view of Ardoin, and further in view of Yokoyama. Claims 11, 16, 23, and 29 contain recitations similar to those recitations of claim 1 discussed above. For at least the reasons discussed above regarding the patentability of claim 1, applicants submit that claims 11, 16, 23, and 29 are patentably defined over the cited art. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 11, 16, 23, and 29 under 35 USC § 103(a).

Claims 3-6, 8-10, 12-15, 18-22, and 25-28 depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 11, 16, and 23. Inasmuch as claims 3-6, 8-10, 12-15, 18-22, and 25-28 depend from independent claims which are patentably defined over the cited art, applicants submit that claims 3-6, 8-10, 12-15, 18-22, and 25-28 are patentably defined over the cited art. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 3-6, 8-10, 12-15, 18-22, and 25-28 under 35 USC § 103(a).

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-1796 / 303920.1
Application No.: 10/681,610
Office Action Dated: September 1, 2009

PATENT

Conclusion

Applicants believe that the present remarks are responsive to each of the points raised by the examiner in the Office Action, and submit that claims 1, 3-6, 8-16, 18-23, and 25-29 of the application are in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and passage to issue of the application at the examiner's earliest convenience is earnestly solicited.

Date: December 1, 2009

/Jon M. Isaacson/

Jon M. Isaacson
Registration No. 60,436

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439